

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed January 8, 2007 considered claims 1-31. Claim 22 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claim 22 has been cancelled.

Claims 19 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The office action states that “[i]n claim 19, ‘The method as recited in claim 17, further comprising...before deserializing the message’ is recited, but no explicit mention of ‘serializing the message’ is mentioned in the independent claim 17 to begin with.” Claim 19 has been amended to remove “before serializing the message” which should obviate the rejection. Claim 22 has been cancelled.

Claims 1, 3, 5-8, 10, 14-15, 17, 19, 21-22, and 28-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)(1) as being anticipated by Barrus et al. (US 2003/0204721) hereinafter *Barrus*. Claims 2, 16, 18, and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Barrus* in view of Yasala et al. (US 2003/0188156) hereinafter *Yasala*.

Claims 4, 9, 12-13, 20 and 23-27 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.¹

By this paper, claims 1, 6, 14, 17, 19, 26, and 29 have been amended, claims 4, 15-16, 25, and 30-31 have been cancelled, and new claims 32 and 33 have been added, such that claims 1-3, 5-14, 17-24, 26-29, and 32-33 remain pending in the application. Notably, claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the allowable subject matter of claim 4, claim 14 has been amended to incorporate the allowable subject matter of claim 12, claim 17 has been amended to incorporate the allowable subject matter of claim 25, and claim 29 has been amended to incorporate the allowable subject matter of claim 23.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the other rejections to the claims are now moot and do not, therefore, need to be addressed individually at this time. It will


¹ Although the prior art status of the cited art is not being challenged at this time, Applicant reserves the right to challenge the prior art status of the cited art at any appropriate time, should it arise. Accordingly, any arguments and amendments made herein should not be construed as acquiescing to any prior art status of the cited art.

be appreciated, however, that this should not be construed as Applicant acquiescing to any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action regarding the cited art or the pending application, including any official notice. Instead, Applicant reserves the right to challenge any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action at any appropriate time in the future, should the need arise. Furthermore, to the extent that the Examiner has relied on any Official Notice, explicitly or implicitly, Applicant specifically requests that the Examiner provide references supporting the teachings officially noticed, as well as the required motivation or suggestion to combine the relied upon notice with the other art of record.

In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney at (801) 533-9800.

Dated this 9th day of April, 2007.

Respectfully submitted,



RICK D. NYDEGGER
Registration No. 28,651
J. LAVAR OLDHAM
Registration No. 53,409
Attorneys for Applicant
Customer No. 47973

RDN:JLO:aam
AAM0000004506V001